Remarks

In this discussion set forth below, Applicant does not acquiesce explicitly to any rejection or averment in this Office Action unless Applicant expressly indicates otherwise.

The non-final Office Action dated April 23, 2008 objects to the title of the invention for not being descriptive. Applicant disagrees. However, without acquiescence and for the purposes of expediting prosecution, Applicant would not object to an Examiner's Amendment changing the title to appear similar to the suggestion in the Office Action (*e.g.*, "Power Converters Having A Single Diode Rectifier For Switch Mode Power Supplies").

The non-final Office Action dated April 23, 2008, lists the following rejection: claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the APEX reference ("APEX Application note 35"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The § 102(b) rejection is improper because the APEX reference fails to teach all the features recited by Applicant's claims. In particular, the cited portions of the APEX reference do not disclose an input circuit having a single diode rectifier and a non-electrolytic capacitor. The APEX reference explicitly discloses that the capacitor C1 is an electrolytic capacitor, which is selected due to availability and price. Moreover, the APEX reference selects the capacitance of capacitor C1 to be 1000 μF, and notes that the larger the capacitor the better. As such, not only does the APEX reference fail to disclose a non-electrolytic capacitor, but it teaches away from selecting non-electrolytic capacitors which are typically available in much lower capacitance values. For example, Applicant's claim 2 recites that the non-electrolytic capacitor has a capacitance of 100 nF, which is 10,000 times smaller than the capacitor C1 disclosed in the APEX reference.

Applicant further submits that the APEX reference fails to disclose a switched mode power supply IC. The APEX reference discloses a pulse wave modulated (PWM) amplifier, which the Examiner has not shown to correspond to the claimed switched mode power supply IC. Applicant submits that the general understanding in the art is that a PWM amplifier feeds a varying signal voltage into a fixed load, whereas a switched mode power supply feeds a fixed voltage into a varying load (*see, e.g.*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Switching_amplifier).

For at least these reasons, Applicant requests that the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 2 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant further submits that the art of record does not teach the subject matter additionally recited in any of the newly added claims 3-13. In particular, the cited art does not appear to disclose the claimed power converter in which the filter further includes both a non-electrolytic capacitor and an electrolytic capacitor that may have a capacitance of 10 μF, for example, as recited in claims 3, 4 and 13. Applicant submits that the cited art also fails to teach the switched mode power supply IC including an internal start-up circuit having a high-voltage start-up current source and without provision of any dissipative bleeder resistor, as recited in claim 11. Applicant observes that the circuit shown in the APEX reference uses a bleeder resistor R2 (*see, e.g.*, Fig. 3).

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: _____

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.537PA)